REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 8-13, and 16-25 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 7, 14, and 15 are cancelled by the present response without prejudice, and new Claims 22-25 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-8, 11, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,424,915 to Katooka et al. (herein "Katooka"). Claims 16-21 were noted as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 9, 10, 12, and 13 were noted as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of the allowable subject matter in claims 9, 10, 12, 13, and 16-21.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

The claims were rejected as the use of the clause "adapted to" made the claim scope unclear.

In response to that position, applicants first believe that that claim language is definite. The basis for the outstanding rejection indicated that such language did not set forth positive limitations, but in that sense applicants note that such a position would appear to only indicate that such claim language was not given any patentable weight, not that it was unclear.

However, to promote prosecution, by the present response each of the claims is amended to no longer recite the term "adapted to", and more particularly the claims are amended to no longer recite the first and second electronic units in the body of the claims.

The presently submitted claim amendments are believed to address the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1-8, 11, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by <u>Katooka</u>, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Applicants initially note each of independent claims 1 and 8 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now clarifies that the "cooling panel forms a U-shape with a space between the upper and lower side flat plate portions". Independent claim 1 now also clarifies that the cooling air passes through the cooling panel by "entering from one of the upper or lower side plate flat portions...and exiting from the other of the upper or lower side flat plate portions at an area outside of the space between the upper and lower side flat plate portions". Independent claim 8 is amended by the present response to recite similar features as in independent claim 1 noted above. The above-noted claim features are believed to be clear from the original specification, for examples in Figures 1 and 2. As shown in those figures, air passes through a cooling panel by entering a port 8 and exiting a port 9. That port 9 through which the cooling air exists is not at an area of the space between the upper and lower side flat plate portions 8, 9.

Such a structure as clarified in the claims is believed to clearly distinguish over <u>Katooka</u>.

<u>Katooka</u> in Figure 2 shows an air flow that exits an upper chamber 3 through an opening adjacent to a ventilation fan 9. However, as clear from Figure 2 in <u>Katooka</u>, clearly that exit point from the upper chamber 3 is in a space between upper chamber 3 and lower

chamber 4. That structure in <u>Katooka</u> is directly contrary to the features clarified in claims 1 and 8 in which an exit point for cooling air is not in such a space.

Applicants also note that such a difference in structure in the claimed features and <u>Katooka</u> results from different objectives in such devices.

One objective that can be realized in the claimed invention is to allow an element to be cooled to be placed in the space between upper and lower side flat plate portions, see for example element 6 to be cooled placed between the space between the upper and lower side flat plate portions in Figure 2 in the present specification. Katooka does not employ such a structure as Katooka utilizes the space between the upper and lower chambers 3 and 4 as an output point for cooling air. That is, Katooka does not address a possibility of placing an element to be cooled in a space between upper and lower chambers 3 and 4, and in such ways Katooka cannot achieve benefits as in the inventions set forth in the claims as currently written.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit amended independent claims 1 and 8, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over the teachings in <u>Katooka</u>.

The present response also sets forth new claims 22-25 for examination, to set forth subject matter indicated as allowable in the outstanding Office Action. More particularly, new independent claim 22 corresponds to previously pending dependent claim 9 rewritten in independent form, but with amendments to address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Further, new independent claim 24 corresponds to previously pending dependent claim 12 rewritten in independent form and new independent claim 25 corresponds to previously pending dependent claim 13 rewritten in independent form; both new claims 24 and 25 are written to avoid the language rejected in those original claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Application No. 10/768,113
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004

Thus, new claims 22-25 are believed to set forth subject matter indicated as allowable in the outstanding Office Action.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Gregory J. Maier Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423

GJM:SNS\law

I:\ATTY\SNS\24'S\247016\247016us-AM DUE 111004.DOC